8. In response to Paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, Defendant denies that any defects exist in Plaintiffs' vehicle. Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 8 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, and therefore denies the same.

9. In response to Paragraph 9 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, Defendant denies that any applicable express or implied warranties failed of their essential purpose, denies that it was a party to the purchase of the subject vehicle by Plaintiffs, denies that any defects existed in the subject vehicle, and denies that even if such defects existed, that Defendant failed to remedy such defects. Any remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 9 state legal conclusions to which no response is required and/or Defendant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth, and therefore Defendant denies the same.

10. In response to Paragraph 10 of Plaintiffs' Complaint, Defendant denies that Central Florida Toyota, or any Toyota-authorized dealership, is an agent of TMS and denies that TMS provided any authority to act on behalf of TMS. Further answering, TMS denies that the conduct under Paragraph (a) through (i) gives rise to an agency relationship between TMS and Central Florida Toyota and denies that Central Florida Toyota created an impression or held itself out that it sells or repairs cars on behalf of TMS. TMS denies that it was the manufacturer of Plaintiffs' vehicle. The relationships between Toyota authorized dealerships and TMS are governed by an agreement, which is a written document that speaks for itself. Further answering, the remaining allegations set forth in Paragraph 10 of Plaintiffs' Complaint state legal conclusions to which no response is required. To the extent a response is deemed to be required,

TOY-TQ002-06-3D-00000190